A Microhistory of Heritage Creation Processes: The Impressionists Exhibited at the Orangerie (1930-1937)

Michela Passini

A Microhistory of Heritage Creation Processes:
The Impressionists Exhibited at the Orangerie (1930-1937)

Michela Passini – CNRS, Institute of Modern and Contemporary History

After isolated examples at the end of the nineteenth century, the temporary exhibition asserted itself at the dawn of the twentieth century as a canonical apparatus of the museum, a pillar of its economy, and a tool of the early politics of the public sphere.[1] The genesis and wide development of temporary exhibitions led to profound transformations of the museum as an institution, of its representations, and the professions traditionally associated with it. While the rise of exhibitions—paid events requiring a wide deployment of advertising resources—introduces a new logic of profitability in establishments with mostly free access, it also induces a structural evolution of the museum's functions. As art history is being founded as a discipline in Europe and the United States, the temporary exhibition permits the serialized gathering and comparison of usually dispersed works of art. It configures an ephemeral form of historical narrative, an alternative to exclusively printed commentaries, and one based on a close interaction between the written word, the visual, and the materiality of objects. Throughout the first part of the twentieth century, particularly significant exhibitions from the point of view of historical construction accelerated the process of affirming museums as producers of a *history* of art.

Since they were of interest to a wider public beyond just specialists, temporary exhibitions also mark in a particularly visible and sometimes spectacular way the canonization of figures, eras, or currents in the history of the arts. In so doing, these events decree the beginning of the status of these things within a national heritage, in other words their inscription within a larger set of symbolic goods with a high identity value. By gathering together ideally complete bodies of work, these events would powerfully contribute to anchoring the oeuvre of an individual or the production of a movement within a shared experience and a shared conception of inheritance and the

[1] On the origin of these exhibitions, see the classic study by Frances Haskell, *The Ephemeral Museum: Old Master Painting and the Rise of the Art Exhibition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

history of art. These events would turn objects into milestones in the construction of aesthetic identities on a municipal, national, or cosmopolitan scale. Through the attractive force of these events as both cultural and social manifestations, the museum's role in the designation and confirmation of artists and objects becomes a more powerful function.

In the case of contemporary art, the role of exhibitions in the process of heritage creation is particularly important. The organization of a retrospective initiates a first phase of historicizing through procedures of attribution, dating, serialization, and the establishment of catalogs. All these inseparably material and intellectual operations determine the passage of recent works from being first objects of critical debate to a higher status as objects within a history that completes their inscription in the long-term arc of an artistic tradition and heritage. The exhibitions thus constitute an ideal observatory to study the most concrete dimensions of tradition and heritage creation. Working on texts alone, however, risks limiting access to only the discursive and conceptual dimensions of the process; whereas studying the construction of a major retrospective means focusing on decision-making procedures, on the development of demonstration techniques, on the construction of the value of works through the swapping of individual pieces, and the many operations of comparison and relationship-making that the objects enter into.

Between1930 and 1937, the Réunion des musées nationaux (RMN) organized in the rooms of the Orangerie seven monographic exhibitions devoted to painters linked for at least part of their careers to the Impressionist movement[2]: Pissarro (1930), Monet (1931), Manet (1932), Renoir (1933), Cézanne (1936) and Degas (1931 and 1937) *(fig. 1)*.[3] These retrospectives were widely discussed in specialized reviews as part of an intellectual context that constitutes the beginning of the historicization of Impressionism. The publication of histories of contemporary painting that attempt to

[2] The definition of Impressionism as a movement and as an aesthetic was in full swing at the time, and the boundaries of the group of "Impressionists" widened or narrowed according to the interpretation given of this art. See Laura Iamurri, "An Impressionism with Variable Geometry", in Neil McWilliam, Michela Passini (Dir.), *The French Historiography of Art 1890-1950* (Paris: Les presses du réel, 2015).
[3] Catalogues: *Centenaire de la naissance de Camille Pissarro. Musée de l'Orangerie, February-March 1930*, Paris, 1930 ; *Claude Monet. Exposition rétrospective. Musée de l'Orangerie, 1931*, Paris, 1931 ; *Degas portraitiste sculpteur. Musée de l'Orangerie*, Paris, 1931 ; *Exposition Manet (1832-1883), Musée de l'Orangerie, 1932*, Paris, 1932 ; *Exposition Renoir, 1841-1919, Musée de l'Orangerie*, 1933, Paris, 1933 ; *Cézanne, Musée de l'Orangerie, 1936*, Paris, 1936 ; *Exposition Degas, Musée de l'Orangerie*, Paris, 1937.
[3] H. Focillon, *La peinture aux XIX^e^ et XX^e^ siècles*, Paris, 1927-1928, 2 vol. ; L. Dimier, *Histoire de la peinture française au XIX^e^ siècle (1793-1890). Deuxième édition revue et augmentée, avec un épilogue allant jusqu'à nos jours* (éd. or. 1914), Paris, 1926..

situate Impressionism in a French and European pictorial tradition[4], the establishment of the first argued inventories or "catalogues raisonnés" of artists who belonged to the movement[5], the publication of Pierre Francastel's synthesis[6] on Impressionism (1937) which proposed a first historical assessment—all these events mark the stages of a process in which the RMN figures as both a symptom and a driving force. Reconstructing their assembly on a micro-historical scale means posing differently the question of the induction of contemporary art into a national heritage. Both the material and intellectual dimensions of that induction will be examined here. In this perspective, studying the practical modalities of the constitution of a given corpus, including both the gathering of works in Paris and the operations of comparison and expert examination that preside over the establishment of catalogues, will allow for an understanding of how, concretely, these different procedures for the classification and accreditation of objects determine the construction of their value, their inscription in an art history, and their positioning in an international hierarchy of heritage prestige. It will not be so much a question of reproducing through the prism of the exhibitions the "critical fortune" of the Impressionists or the evolutions of a "taste" of Impressionism during the 1930s, but rather an exploration of the museum machine whose functioning we will try to understand along with the effects on the assessment of objects.

Decision-making and Corpus Construction

Starting in October 1927, the four rooms of the Orangerie not devoted to the permanent exhibition of Monet's *Water Lilies* were given over to temporary exhibitions of the Réunion des musées nationaux. French painting of the nineteenth century is the main

[4] Henri Focillon, *La peinture aux XIX^e^ et XX^e^ siècles*, Paris, 1927-1928, 2 vol. ; Louis Dimier, *Histoire de la peinture française au XIX^e^ siècle (1793-1890). Deuxième édition revue et augmentée, avec un épilogue allant jusqu'à nos jours* (éd. or. 1914), Paris, 1926.

[5] Paul Jamot and Georges Wildenstein, with the collaboration of Marie-Louise Bataille, *Manet, Catalogue critique*, Paris, 1932, 2 vols.; Lionello Venturi *Cézanne, son art, son œuvre*,, Paris, 1936, 2 vol. See also the first argued catalogue of Van Gogh's work which served as a model for a wide series of catalogues of contemporary painters: Jacob Baart de la Faille, *L'œuvre de Vincent van Gogh, catalogue raisonné*, Paris and Bruxelles, 1928, 4 vol.

[6] Pierre Francastel, *L'impressionnisme. Les origines de la peinture moderne de Monet à Gauguin*, Paris, 1937.

focus of these retrospectives.[7] Public favor, the interest of specialists, and the desire to involve the institution in certain commemorations (e.g., the centenary of Romanticism, the centenary of the birth of Pissarro or Manet) were certainly determining factors in the choice of the themes of these events, but the source materials do not always allow one to reconstruct with precision the decision-making process.[8] In the case of some exhibitions the minutes of the advisory committee of the Réunion des musées nationaux clearly show that the initiative came from a curator; however, the origin of the retrospectives on the Impressionists is not so explicitly stated. These documents bear witness to a situation where, on the one hand, the practice of temporary exhibitions is not yet included within a regime of authorization of the intendant type, and where, on the other hand, the programming of the museum's activities is only beginning to be organized continuously throughout the year.[9] Thus, in the case of *Monet* we learn that on March 5, 1931, Jean Guiffrey "presents (...) to the committee the project of the exhibition."[10] However, the hosting of a retrospective on Renoir seems to have been considered for the first time in a collegial manner only six months before it opened as a substitute for a failed *Goya* exhibition that had been previously planned.[11]

In the case of other Impressionist exhibitions there is hardly any more precise information about origins. It is therefore difficult to define exactly the contribution of each actor. Among the staff of the Louvre's painting department which contributed most of the exhibited works that belong to French public collections, the chief curator, Jean Guiffrey, was a recognized specialist of the eighteenth century, while his deputy, René Huyghe, was put in charge in 1927 of overseeing the Moreau-Nélaton documentation, which resulted in an acquisition by the Louvre, and he set about writing a history of

---

[7] Agnès Callu, *La Réunion des Musées nationaux*, *1870-1940. Genèse et fonctionnement*, Paris, 1994. On the exhibitions organized by the RMN at the Orangerie, see especially pages 363-371 and 427-438.

[8] The RMN scrupulously quantifies the success of its exhibitions: the minutes of the advisory committee report, at each meeting, the number of admissions and the revenues of exhibitions in progress. Archives of the Musées nationaux, series consulted: 1 BB 41, 1 BB 42 and 1 BB 43. About the revenue, Agnès Callu gives these figures (*Op. Cit.* p. 430): Manet, 751,000 francs; Renoir, 575,827 francs; Corot, 564,527 francs; Cézanne, 460,589 francs; Degas 298,850 francs.

[9] Nathalie Heinich and Michael Pollack, « Du conservateur de musée à l'auteur d'expositions : l'invention d'une position singulière », *Sociologie du travail*, ["From museum curator to exhibition author: the invention of a singular position"] 1, 1989, pp. 29-49

[10] Archives des musées nationaux, 1 BB 41, "Musées nationaux, Procès verbaux du comité consultatif," meeting of March 5, 1931, f. 280.

[11] "We are planning a Goya exhibition for the summer. The Prado has only agreed to lend a few drawings, so the question is whether this exhibition is possible without the help of the Prado, a question currently under study. If the Goya exhibition cannot proceed, it can be replaced by a Renoir exhibition." Archives des musées nationaux, 1 BB 42, "Musées nationaux, Procès verbaux du comité consultatif," meeting of December 22, 1932, f. 113.

twentieth-century art for the magazine he edited with Germain Bazin, *L'Amour de l'art*.[12] Huyghe also asserted himself at the start of the 1930s as one of the leading lights of the RMN's exhibition policy by organizing two important and sensitive retrospectives: *Delacroix* (Louvre, 1930) and the *Exhibition of French Art 1200-1900* which opened at the Royal Academy in 1932. The studies on Impressionist painters that Huyghe published in his journal on the occasion of the exhibitions at the Orangerie suggest that his participation in their elaboration was significant.[13] An important role in the implementation of these events was also played by Paul Jamot who wrote the texts which served as an introduction to the catalogues, but who, unlike Guiffrey and Huyghe, did not sit on the advisory committee of the RMN charged with debating and approving exhibition projects. Charles Sterling, then attaché-chargé de mission in the department of paintings, was also an essential although less visible actor in this first phase of historiography of Impressionism, because he produced most of the catalogues of these exhibitions. We can also mention Henry Verne, director of the RMN, who personally managed the relationships with lenders and was therefore at the heart of the construction process of each exhibition.

Apart from the first of the two *Degas* exhibitions (1931) devoted to the work of Degas the portraitist and sculptor, the other six clearly testify to the organizers' ambition to render an overall assessment of the career of each of these painters by bringing together a large number of works representative of each phase of the artist's career. More "revisions" than "consecrations," in Huyghe's words[14], these exhibitions were intended to be above all exhaustive. Thus, for the Manet exhibition one hundred and fifty-six works were visible which represented more than a quarter of the artist's known production.[15] This desire to build the most coherent and complete sets of work possible becomes an argument in the correspondence with lenders. However, this

---

[12] René Huyghe (dir.), *Histoire de l'art contemporain : la peinture. Documentation réunie par Germain Bazin, avec une préface de Jean Mistler, Introduction par Henri Focillon*, Paris, 1934. The chapters of the book had appeared separately in "*The Love of Art"* magazine between January 1933 and December 1934. On *L'Amour de l'art*, see C. Fraixe, "L'Amour de l'art. Une revue "ni droite ni gauche" au début des années 30," in R. Froissart and Y. Chevrefils Desbiolles, *Les revues d'art : formes, stratégies et réseaux au XX^e siècle*, Rennes, 2011, p. 255-279.

[13] Note also that the organization of these exhibitions was attributed to him in a report that Georges Salles, then director of the National Museums, wrote in 1945 to support the proposal to award Huyghe the Medal of the Resistance. Huyghe is described as the "organizer of the famous exhibitions held at the Orangerie, until 1939, that were devoted to the great masters of impressionist art," Archives des Musées nationaux, O-30-358, "Huyghe René."

[14] René Huyghe, "Conclusions à l'exposition Renoir," *L'Amour de l'art*, XIV, 1933, 1.

[15] The catalogue raisonné of Manet's work by Paul Jamot and Georges Wildenstein (1932) included 546 entries.

approach is criticized by those who, like Elie Faure, defend a conception of the exhibition as an argued choice privileging a few masterpieces, each of which, highlighted by a spacious hanging, must fit into an arrangement governed first by aesthetic principles over historical or thematic considerations.[16]

The ambition of the organizers to build monographic exhibitions that would be as complete as possible must be understood in the light of the high levels of dispersion of Impressionist art. Of the 156 works by Manet exhibited between June and October 1932, 63 belonged to French public collections. It should be noted, however, that taken on its own this figure tends to increase the specific weight of French museums in the international system of modern art collections, because it actually includes 36 prints loaned by the National Library, pieces considered of lower rank than paintings. The number of Manet's paintings from French institutions amounted to 27. The *Renoir* exhibition included only 11 works from French public collections out of 144 exhibited pieces, while the *Cézanne* exhibition had 5 out of 195, and the retrospective on Degas presented 58 public pieces out of a total of 245. But as with the *Manet* exhibition, we must take into account the high number of Degas prints loaned by the National Library. Although the majority of the paintings on display came from French private collections, an analysis of the distribution of the art nevertheless confirms the importance of foreign collections, both public and private, with a large number of works coming from the United States and Germany. Such a situation powerfully influenced the modes of historicization and heritage creation when it comes to Impressionism, since the staging in Paris required a lot of movement of various works of art. The dispersion of the objects therefore led to negotiations between potential lenders and organizers of the exhibition out of which the heritage value of these pieces would be built.

Tools and Procedures for the Historicization of Contemporary Art: The Rise of Connoisseurship

[16] In 1930, Elie Faure castigated the museology of the exhibitions devoted to Delacroix (Louvre, 1930), Courbet (Petit Palais, 1929) and Pissarro (Orangerie, 1930): "Réflexions sur l'accrochage: Delacroix, Courbet, Pissarro" [1930], in A. Desvallées (éd.), *Vagues: Une anthologie de la nouvelle muséologie*, Paris, 1992, 289-293.

By bringing together in an exceptional way these usually dispersed bodies of work, the exhibitions at the Orangerie offered art historians the opportunity to study and compare works of art that were otherwise inaccessible. And though ephemeral, these retrospectives nevertheless produced documents destined to last, namely their catalogues which represent a memorial trace of the exhibition while also being the main tool of its implementation. It is around the establishment of the catalogue that the collection of material and historical data concerning each piece and the elaboration of the narrative presiding over the exhibition were organized. The catalogues were the result of extensive bibliographic and iconographic research and were designed to provide specialists with an assemblage of fundamental information. Therefore they would become obligatory reference works, especially in the case of artists whose work had not yet been the subject of a catalogue raisonné. In his synthesis of the history of Impressionism (1937), Francastel would praise the catalogues of the exhibitions of the Orangerie as irreplaceable instruments for the historian of the movement.[17]

The catalogues of the Orangerie exhibitions all respect the same typographical and formal principles.[18] In the case of retrospectives on the Impressionists, with the exception of *Pissarro*, these are small-format, paperback publications of about 100 to 150 pages, comprising the main text plus 30 to 40 black and white plates.[19] Printed by either Frazier-Soye or Georges Lang, there would be 2,500 copies for the first edition, with always a second and sometimes a third corrected edition. These details, far from being anecdotal, plunge us into the heart of the question of the manufacture of a *history* of Impressionism.

These exhibition catalogues were produced either in the absence of a catalogue raisonné of the artist, as in the case of the *Renoir* catalogue, or in conjunction with the establishment of the first such authoritative catalogue: those of Manet prepared by Paul Jamot, Georges Wildenstein, and Marie-Louise Bataille (1932); of Cézanne by Lionello Venturi (1936); and of Degas by Paul-André Lemoisne (in preparation since the mid-thirties but published only in 1954). The catalogues thus constitute a first attempt, prior

[17] Francastel, 1937 *Op. Cit.* in Note 4, reprinted 1974, p. 205.
[18] M. Tchernia-Blanchard, "Le catalogue d'exposition, un outil scientifique ? La mise en place de nouvelles pratiques au musée de l'Orangerie dans les années 1930," oral communication, part of the one-day conference *Les musées français et la pratique de l'exposition temporaire (1900-1950). Muséologie, politiques culturelles et symboliques*, Paris, INHA and Ecole du Louvre, June 20, 2012, edited by Cédric Lesec, Michela Passini, and Marie Tchernia-Blanchard, forthcoming.
[19] The exhibition catalogue *Renoir* is an exception, with 64 plates, while that of the exhibition *Degas portraitiste et sculpteur* has 16.

to any attempts at heritage creation, to establish the history of the works, to determine, for some, the date and conditions of execution, to identify their diffusion through reproductions and their critical reception—in sum, to establish the "career" of a work of art in cases where existing accounts were often lacking or incomplete. For example, in the case of Manet, there already existed a first summary catalogue prepared by Théodore Duret[20], as well as the documentary works by Adolphe Tabarant and Etienne Moreau-Nélaton[21] that Georges Wildenstein made available to the printers of his catalogue in preparation.[22] However, in the case of Renoir, no preliminary investigation that precisely encompassed the history of all his works was available. The catalogue of the *Renoir* exhibition went through three editions, each containing numerous and significant modifications compared to the previous one, particularly with regard to the dating of the pieces.

These catalogues engage in a set of analytical practices that can be considered as the first deployment of *connoisseurship* regarding modern painting. The then still incomplete situation of the studies led to the development of critical tools in the catalogue and to offering hypotheses about dating directly in the catalogue text itself. These works thus participated in a broader evolution of the exhibition catalogue as a genre that, in the interwar period, evolves from a mere list of works to being a locus of specialized study and scholarly debate about works of art.

In addition to a work's title, date, size, medium, and its place of conservation, the notices include a list of works in which it has been the focus of commentary as well as information about available reproductions. The order of the notices is strictly

---

[20] Th. Duret, *Histoire d'Edouard Manet et de son œuvre, avec un catalogue de peintures et de pastels*, Paris, 1902. The catalogue compiled by Duret included 440 works.

[21] Has. Tabarant, *Manet, Manet*, *histoire catalographique*, Paris, 1931; E. Moreau-Nélaton, Catalogue général manuscrit de l'œuvre d'Edouard Manet, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes et de la photographie, Z-89-4 (this catalogue, comprising 427 items, was already accessible in 1932: Wildenstein and Jamot had been able to consult it during the preparation of their own catalogue of Manet's work, see Jamot-Wildenstein, 1932, *Op. Cit.*, vol. I, p. IV). In addition, a catalogue highly appreciated at the time for its accuracy was the one produced by the Berlin gallery Matthiesen on the occasion of a Manet exhibition held in 1928: *Cat. Exp., Ausstellung Edouard Manet. Gamälde, PastelWatercolour Zeichnungen*, *6 Februar bis 18 März 1928*, Berlin, 1928; review of the exhibition by F. Fosca, *L'Amour de l'art*, 9, 1928, p. 149: "Congratulations also to the Matthiesen Gallery for taking advantage of the exhibition to publish a very beautiful catalogue. It contains not only excellent reproductions, but also the most accurate information about the works on display."

[22] G. Wildenstein, letter to Henri Verne, dated April 21, 1932: "I will gladly make available to these committees the information that I have gathered thanks to a long familiarity with Manet and the preparation, in collaboration with M. Jamot and Miss Bataille, of a complete catalogue which will appear at about the time when the exhibition opens," Archives des Musées nationaux, X exhibitions 9, "Comité d'organisation."

chronological. This type of organization, which may seem self-evident, calls for at least two remarks. First, by arranging the works chronologically, the catalogue adopts a different logic from that which governs their hanging. The photographs of the rooms that have been preserved, and this is particularly the case for the *Renoir* exhibition *(figs. 2 and 3)*, show that the arrangement of the paintings was dictated by thematic and aesthetic principles, in particular by the symmetry of formats and sizes, and not by chronology. This exhibition technique was dominant in French museums until the early 1950s. Its influence was not limited to the hanging alone but seems to be related to more widespread perceptual habits and organizational practices. Thus, in the catalogue raisonné of Manet's work by Jamot and Wildenstein prepared at the same time as the exhibition at the Orangerie (1932), the notices follow the chronological order, while the illustrations were grouped, as is noted, "so as to compose pages as pleasing as possible to the eye." Therefore, one was not to "look in their arrangement for a strictly methodical or chronological order."[23]

This lack of organization other than on purely aesthetic grounds is all the more striking since the catalogues that Wildenstein devoted to the work of eighteenth-century artists do classify the reproductions in chronological order. Given the absence of in-depth studies on the history of writings on the exhibitions and catalogues of nineteenth-century painting, it is difficult to say with certainty that this is a practice specific to the historiography of contemporary art. And yet, some testimonies of the time seem to suggest that symmetrical hanging was a French museological tradition. Thus, for example, in 1932, Julius Meier-Graefe sharply criticized the museological choices that presided over the hanging of nineteenth century works, during the exhibition of masterpieces of French art organized by René Huyghe at the Royal Academy in London: "They were more concerned about the symmetry of formats than what was inside the frames. The result is especially felt in the nineteenth century rooms where the mixture is unbearable. Corot's mostly small format paintings are scattered in three different rooms." It is interesting to note that in his reply to Meier-Graefe published by the journal *Formes*, Huyghe defended his own museological choices as being inspired by "French

[23] Jamot-Wildenstein, 1932 *Op. Cit.* vol. II, "Avertissement," no page number.

methods" of a distinct intellectual tradition and endowed with a strong national specificity.[24]

The chronological order of the records in the Orangerie catalogues calls for a second remark. In the case of works by Renoir or Cézanne whose dating was subject to debate at the time, the notices undergo considerable revisions over the exhibition's duration and with each reprinting of the booklets. The possibility of seeing the work of these painters gathered in one place allowed for advanced stylistic analyses which led to revisions about the dating of certain paintings, and therefore to modifications in the order of the notices. The second edition of the *Renoir* catalogue thus includes 36 modified and moved notices (out of 144) compared to the first. In the third edition, three more notices are modified and moved. Between the two editions of the *Cézanne* catalogue (1936), the changes of dates are so numerous that it is decided not to modify the original ordering, and therefore in the second edition the notices do not appear in chronological order.

Also, these catalogues do not simply state "facts" but also put forward hypotheses, which is something new in the history of the exhibition catalogue. The case of Renoir is exemplary of this beginning of a catalographic practice open to discussion and the active exercise of expertise. The *Poirier d'Angleterre* (English Pear Tree), dated 1875 in the first edition of the catalogue, appears in the second as: "painted around 1869." The revision of the date is justified by comparison with stylistically similar works: "This date is suggested by the form of the signature and by the execution of the backgrounds in the 'Lise' at the Essen Museum and the 'Ménage Sisley' exhibited under No. 4."[25] The notice of the *Laveuses* (The Washers*)* passed from being number 106 of the first edition to 122a in the second. This change introduces the mode of hypothesis into the discursive workings of the museum catalogue by means of the use of the question mark: "Painted around 1902 (?). The style and craftsmanship of this painting are similar

[24] "Le procès de l'exposition d'art français à Londres. Réquisitoire de Julius Meier-Graefe. Plaidoirie de René Huyghe," *Formes*, XXIII, March 1932, pp. 230-232. Similarly, Margaret Scolari-Barr, the wife of Alfred Barr, highlighted the spread of this type of museology in France, in the years between the two wars, contrasting it with practices then current in the United States: quoted by M. A. Staniszewski, *The Power of Display. A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*, Cambridge Mass., 1998, p. 62.
[25] In the final third edition of the *Renoir* catalogue, the "English Pear Tree" appears as number 6a, p. 3, whereas in the second corrected edition this painting appeared as number 26.

to those of the artist's last style from around 1913, but Renoir made several paintings around 1902-05 that indicate the date proposed here is plausible."[26]

This choice to open to the reader the laboratory of the catalogue, to display and therefore open up to debate the operations that lead to the dating of works of art, is part of a set of catalographic practices that can also be found in other publications of the time. In 1932, the catalogue raisonné of Manet's work included paintings whose authenticity was not unanimously recognized by critics. This decision, taken by Georges Wildenstein over the objections of Paul Jamot[27], made it possible to set up procedures of recognition and authentication via comparison in the very space of the catalog which thus became the place of an expert debate about the objects. But though the practice of inclusion and discussion within the catalogue of non-authentic works was customary for older periods of painting, it was much less common in the case of the "moderns" at that time. The catalogue raisonné of Van Gogh's work, published in 1928 by Jacob Baart de la Faille and considered a model of the genre, mentioned only those works considered by the editor to be authentic.

By making the process of expertise visible, the Orangerie exhibition catalogues highlight the interpretive work that engages the responsibility of the author. The result is a new form of recognition for the catalographer. In the first three catalogues of the series (*Pissarro*, *Monet*, and *Manet*), the notices were not signed, whereas the prefaces and introductory texts were attributed to Jamot. It was starting with the Renoir catalogue, which required considerable research and verification of the data concerning each painting, that we see the mention "This catalogue was written by Mr. Charles Sterling, attaché-chargé de mission in the Department of Paintings at the Louvre Museum." The exhibition catalogue thus attained the status of being a scientific work, an exercise of *connoisseurship* over contemporary art, and the temporary exhibition became one of the privileged places of its expression.

Swapping Works of Art and Building Value

[26] In the first edition of the catalogue, the work appears as number 106; in the second corrected edition it becomes number 122a, p. 45; in the third definitive edition (pp. 51-52), the date is again modified: "Painted around 1913. The style and craftsmanship of this work are similar to those of the artist's last way of painting."

[27] Jamot-Wildenstein, 1932 *Op. Cit.* vol. I, p. VI.

Because of their ambition to be exhaustive, these retrospectives depend on the loaning of works agreed to by other institutions and individuals. The rise of temporary exhibitions at the dawn of the twentieth century determined the emergence of an international system of museums based on a complex circulation of artwork. For a museum, sending art from its collections to outside exhibitions becomes a crucial means for securing, in turn, the loans that will allow it to mount its own exhibitions. Also, lending works to major institutions, especially foreign ones, is the means for a curator to guarantee the increased visibility of their collection. Where one exhibits, what one exhibits and how often, what pieces one manages to obtain and from which partners—these are now the fundamental criteria for positioning museums in an international hierarchy of heritage prestige. Thus, tracing the rise of temporary exhibitions in the twentieth century implies taking into account the geohistory and more importantly the geopolitics of museums.

This highly competitive international exhibition system has its margins and its centers which are naturally relative, mobile, and temporary. It is nevertheless possible to measure the force of attraction by analyzing the choices of the actors involved in these exchanges. These museum officials, curators, and directors find themselves having to manage two types of variables: on the one hand, the need to ensure the visibility of their collection in events of international scope in order to increase its attractiveness for both a local and global public; on the other hand, the risks that repeated travel poses to precious and sometimes fragile works, as well as the fear of a drop in local attendance, due to the lack of identity enhancing pieces for the museum. While the organizers implicitly assert the preeminence of Paris on the world museum scene, potential lenders highlight, from their perspective, the quality of the work requested, its value and rank within an economy of prestige and scarcity, and the exceptional nature of the loan being granted. These are strong arguments which local actors use to obtain better conditions for their home institution. Thus, in exchange for the objects they agree to lend, some curators request the deposit of a certain number of art works deemed of "equivalent" quality which will then adorn the walls of their museum for the duration of the exhibition. This approach gives rise to complex transactions the challenge of which is precisely the possibility of comparing and measuring the "quality" of works of art. It is

during these exchanges that the value of works is negotiated—a symbolic, "heritage value" distinct from the market value, and one which requires specific expertise.[28]

The correspondence with German institutions during the setting up of the *Monet* exhibition (June-September 1931) sheds light on some of the issues involved in the exchange of objects, both for lenders and for organizers. On May 4, the director of France's Musées nationaux, Henri Verne, contacted the director of the Kunsthalle Bremen, Emil Waldmann, to request the loan of Monet's *Portrait de Camille (fig. 4).*[29] The discussion revolves around the audience strategies put in place by the Kunsthalle and focuses on the valorization of Monet's painting. Following a first negative response from Waldmann who explains that such a loan would deprive his museum of its "strongest point of attraction,"[30] Verne decides to insist and proposes an exchange of works, according to a practice that was then beginning to spread among the curators of major European museums. To replace the void left by the *Portrait de Camille*, the RMN would lend the *Angelina* by Manet *(fig. 5).* Verne will not succeed, but it is interesting to consider the arguments he uses to highlight the interest of Manet's painting: "For many of your fellow citizens and many visitors to your galleries," he argues, this painting "would have the attraction of being a never-seen-before work since of all the leading paintings by the creator of the *Olympia*, it is the most recent to enter the Louvre."[31] The novelty and rarity of the aesthetic experience that would be offered by the presence of the work in Bremen are factors of its accreditation in the context of this exchange proposal. But Waldmann preferred to bet on (his estimate of) certain value, namely a steady flow of museum-goers, both local and international, attracted to the Kunsthalle by the *Portrait de Camille*.

Nevertheless, other players in the world of German museums will be sensitive to the "attraction of the unseen" offered by the *Angelina* painting and the possibility of ensuring that the works in their collections would have access to the Paris museum

---

[28] On the construction of the value of works of art, see: N. Heinich, *L'art contemporain exposé aux rejets: études de cas*, Nîmes, 1998, in particular Chapter VII, "En guise de synthèse. L'art contemporain exposé aux rejets, pour une sociologie des valeurs," pp. 195-213; N. Heinich and R. Schapiro (Dir.), *De l'artification: Enquêtes sur le passage à l'art*, Paris, 2012, especially the chapter by Heinich and Schapiro, " Quand y a-t-il artification?," pp. 267-299; Ch. Bessy *Experts et faussaires. Pour une sociologie de la perception*, Paris, 1995, in particular the chapter "Querelles d'attribution," pp. 136-172.

[29] H. Verne, letter to E. Waldmann, May 4, 1931, Archives of the National Museums, X Expositions 7, "Prêteurs", "Brême". We list all the exhibited works with the titles attributed to them at the time, as they appear in the catalogues of the exhibitions at the Orangerie and in correspondence between the organizers.

[30] E. Waldmann, letter to H. Verne, May 6, 1931, *Ibid*.

[31] H. Verne, letter to E. Waldmann, May 12, 1931, *Ibid*.

scene. At the beginning of May, Verne asked the Städtische Galerie in Frankfurt (the Branch of the Städelsches Kunstinstitut for modern art collections) for Monet's *Le Déjeuner (fig. 6).* The director, Georg Swarzenski, was initially forced to refuse the loan, since he had already promised that piece to the modern painting exhibition *Vom Abbild zum Sinnbild*, organized at the Städelsches Kunstinstitut by the director of the Städelschule, Fritz Wichert, and scheduled for June.[32] Swarzenski's letters testify to his eagerness to give greater visibility to a collection of modern art that he had greatly contributed to creating while acknowledging the challenge of sending one of the works to a major Paris exhibition. "I would like very much," he tells Verne on May 15, "to have this painting seen in your Monet exhibition."[33] Swarzenski intervened with Wichert and asked Verne to lend him "an important painting by Manet" which would replace Monet's *Le Déjeuner* at the Frankfurt exhibition. On May 19, the talks resulted in the offer of *L'Angelina* which the director of the Kunsthalle in Bremen had definitively refused two days earlier. Immediately accepted by Swarzenski and Wichert, it was in fact exchanged for *Le Déjeuner*, which appeared at the Paris *Monet* exhibition.[34]

These two episodes illustrate the conflict which becomes recurrent with the spread of the practice of the temporary exhibition: on the one hand there were public policies tending to erect one or more works as flagship objects of the museum without which it would be deprived of its main "attractions"; and on the other, the visibility strategies where the challenge for the institutions was to have a presence on a legitimizing stage of prime importance because of its centrality. In the case of Monet's *Le Déjeuner*, Swarzenski decides that his presence in Paris will contribute more to the international visibility of the work, and therefore of its home museum, than any uninterrupted exhibition in Frankfurt could achieve. The passage through major capitals of works from peripheral museums would indeed give rise to new requests for loans.

One of the factors that structures the international exhibition system was the competition of museum institutions to be represented on the most central stages. The challenge is not only the visibility of the collections, but also the integration of the museum into networks of world-renowned institutions. The talks initiated at the *Manet*

[32] G. Swarzenski, letter to H. Verne, 12 May 1931, Archives of the National Museums, X Expositions 7, "Prêteurs", "Frankfurt-a-M Städelsches Kunstinstitut ».
[33] *Id*., letter to H. Verne, May 15, 1931, *Ibid*.
[34] *Id*., telegram to H. Verne, May 19, 1931, *Ibid*.

exhibition are an example of this. The RMN was seeking to obtain from the Nationalgalerie in Berlin three pieces by Manet: *Dans la serre*, *La Maison de campagne à Rueil,* and *Les Lilas*. The importance of the loans requested led to reaching out to André François-Poncet, then France's ambassador in Berlin, who served as an intermediary between the two institutions. The director of the Nationalgalerie, Ludwig Justi, would rely on official expertise (the first work, *In the Greenhouse*, had been appraised at ten million francs); he also insisted on the cost, symbolic and financial, of the absence of the three Manets paintings "during the summer months."[35] On the strength of these arguments, he asked for the deposit in Berlin of three works considered of capital importance to the French nineteenth century: David's *Portrait de l'artiste*, Géricault's *Officier des grenadiers*, and Corot's *Le Beffroi de Douai* (The Belfry of Douai). He also demands that the three Manet pieces be insured for five million francs.[36] Faced with Justi's arguments, the RMN can only resort to exploiting the symbolic prestige deriving from participation in an exhibition that brings together the most visible museums on the international scene. Anticipating these difficulties, André François-Poncet gives a particularly lucid analysis of the situation when he writes to Verne on April 23: "I have the impression that, if I can give him [Justi] the guarantee that collectors and museums in the United States and England, for example, will be particularly generous with their loans, he will give you more easily complete satisfaction."[37]

But how exactly does arriving at an equivalence between different works of art happen in practice? What kind of considerations go into establishing criteria for quality? In truth, what emerges from such correspondence is the low level of explicitness regarding these criteria which are formulated, argued for, and debated only when transactions become difficult due to strong disagreements between the principal actors. The talks between the RMN and the Tournai Museum offer an example of this, and it is all the more interesting because, in this case, the exchange is organized between works of Manet and older paintings. The heterogeneity of the objects on each side of the bargain and the difficulty of the negotiations ultimately call for more explicitness about the equivalency criteria.

---

[35] A. François-Poncet, letter to H. Verne, April 23, 1932, Archives of the National Museums, X Expositions 9, "Prêteurs", "Berlin National Gallery."
[36] *Id*., telegram to H. Verne, June 8, 1932, *Ibid* ; H. Verne, Attestation concernant l'assurance des trois œuvres, June 11, 1932, *Ibid*.
[37] A. François-Poncet, letter to H. Verne, April 23, 1932, *Ibid*.

On this occasion, the RMN asked the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Tournai for the loan of *Argenteuil* and *Chez le père Lathuille (fig. 7).* The two paintings had already been exhibited a few months before at the exhibition of French art at the Royal Academy in London (January-March 1932). They occupy an absolutely central position in Manet's oeuvre and in the canon of modern painting as it is taking shape in the thirties. In the eyes of the organizers, their presence is therefore essential to the success of the future exhibition.[38] Contacted by Verne on May 10, the curator of the Tournai museum, Léonce Pion, expresses his reservations while also evoking "the new luster that would shine forth on [Tournai's] collections" were his museum to participate in this way in the Orangerie's Manet retrospective.[39] The Musée des Beaux-Arts de Tournai was then a young institution in the field of modern art having reopened its rooms in 1928 after the acquisitions of the collections of contemporary painting from Henri Van Cutsem, including the two Manets requested by the RMN.[40] On May 13, Verne decided to call on a particularly influential mediator, Paul Lambotte, who was a former director of the Tournai fine art museum and the Belgian government's exhibitions commissioner. Lambotte was very much in favor of Belgium's participation in a cultural event of this magnitude. In his correspondence with Verne, he insists on "the interest *for Tournai* to include the two Manet paintings in the exhibition of the centenary of the master."[41] Léonce Pion and the members of the college of aldermen who must decide on the loan say they are willing to send the two Manets to Paris, but they ask for the temporary deposit in Tournai of works from Parisian museums. In the course of the ensuing negotiations, the question of the equivalence of objects is raised explicitly.

A first proposal for a swap evokes two key paintings from the Flemish fifteenth century preserved in the Louvre and the Petit Palais, respectively. The first is the Braque Triptych by Rogier Van der Weyden (who in these exchanges appears most often under the name of Roger de la Pasture) *(fig. 8)*, the second is the *Presentation at the Temple* by Jacques Daret, bequeathed to the City of Paris by Edward Tuck. Pion also asked that the two Manets of the Tournai museum be insured for a value of three million francs. In a

[38] H. Verne, letter to J. Bourguignon, June 2, 1932, Archives des Musées nationaux, X Expositions 9, "Prêteurs", "Tournai".
[39] L. Pion, letter to H. Verne, May 13, 1932, *Ibid*.
[40] L. Pion and I. Pion-Leblanc, *Musée des Beaux-Arts de Tournai*. *Catalogue des peintures et des sculptures*, Tournai, 1971.
[41] P. Lambotte, letter to H. Verne, May 18, 1932, Archives des Musées nationaux, X Expositions 9, "Prêteurs", "Tournai": "pour Tournai" is underlined in the text of the letter.

letter dated May 27, Verne announces that the Petit Palais has agreed to lend the Jacques Daret.[42] However the Braque Triptych could not be moved because of its fragile state of conservation, and he therefore proposed instead the *Salutation angélique* from the Louvre and attributed, as he pointed out adroitly, to Rogier Van der Weyden *(fig. 9)*. Pion replied on 30 May: the members of the college of aldermen were "completely disappointed." "The two Manets in question," he writes, "are the leading pieces of our provincial museum and they attract a large public of amateur enthusiasts. The Roger de la Pasture is of great interest to our city because of its intrinsic qualities and its origins that you know as well as we do."[43]

Two types of reasoning come into play here and allow for arriving at an equivalency of the Braque Triptych and the Manets requested by the RMN. The first concerns the "intrinsic qualities," both material and aesthetic, of the object: the Braque Triptych is complete whereas the *Salutation angélique* in the Louvre, considered non-equivalent to the Manet by Pion and the Tournai college of aldermen, is the central panel of a triptych whose two side panels are in Turin. In addition, the Braque Triptych is recognized as a work of Van der Weyden, while, in the case of the *Salutation angélique*, art historians at the time hesitated between this artist and an alternate attribution to the "school of the Maître de Flémalle."[44] The second line of thinking that gets invoked relates to the "origins" of the work. Having been painted for Jehan Braque de Tournai and his wife Catherine de Brabant, the altarpiece is of "powerful interest for [the] city"; therefore its temporary stay in Tournai would contribute to the celebration of the city's identity.

The reasons related to conservation will eventually end up having the upper hand and so the Tournai museum will have to do without both the Braque Triptych and the Jacques Daret from the Tuck collection. It will obtain instead the *Salutation angélique* from the Louvre and the Triptych of the Resurrection by Hans Memling. It should be noted that in this case the quality criteria which structure the comparison and equivalency gestures can be argued for because, if disagreement arises, Pion's requests relate to objects considered, in principle, as comparable. Whereas they will not be

[42] In reality, Edward Tuck, who had bequeathed the work to the Petit Palais, refused to authorize its transfer: H. Verne, telegram to L. Pion, June 8, 1932, *Ibid*.
[43] L. Pion, letter to Henri Verne, May 30, 1932, *Ibid*.
[44] The work is attributed to the school of Robert Campin, known as the Mâitre de Flémalle, in the most recent catalogue of the Louvre available at the time: L. Demonts and L. Huteau, *Musée du Louvre. Catalogue général des peintures (tableaux et peintures décoratives)*, Paris, 1923, n° 2202, p. 136.

explicitly spelled out when the proposal for swapping concerns works that appear to representatives of the RMN as clearly uncomparable in their aesthetic, historical, and commercial value. This turned out to be the case for a proposal from the Chicago Art Institute. In exchange for the loan of Manet's *Races at Longchamp* and *Jesus Mocked by the Soldiers*, its director asked to borrow the *Mona Lisa* which was immediately refused.[45]

A final example of a transaction between the RMN and a German museum sheds light on one of the factors which determine the value creation of works of art, and therefore their possible equivalency for the purposes of these art swaps. For the *Renoir* exhibition, the organizers asked the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne for the loan of the *Ménage Sisley*. The director, Otto Förster, accepts in principle, but specifies by telegram: "We desire a good Manet or good Corot *really equivalent* to the Renoir.[46]" The question of equivalence criteria arose in all its magnitude when the RMN proposed to lend to Cologne the *Moulin Saint-Nicolas-les-Arras* by Corot, then held by the Louvre. Förster's reaction was mixed and it is interesting to note what arguments he uses in his response. "As for the *Moulin Saint-Nicolas* (painted in 1874) that you have kindly offered us," he writes, "I am very sad not to remember exactly this painting, nor to have seen a reproduction of it."[47] In other words, the existence of reproductions, implying the degree of media coverage of the work, becomes an essential factor in the construction of heritage value. In the case of nineteenth-century art whose status some fifty years later was not yet fully crystallized, the specialized press is a powerful device for designation and confirmation. Thus, Förster includes with his letter a list of eleven paintings from the Musées nationaux that he would agree to swap for Renoir's *Ménage Sisley*. For each painting the list mentions very precisely the books or magazines that have published a reproduction of it.

Toward Making Impressionism Part of a National Heritage

[45] G. Wildenstein, letter to H. Verne, June 2, 1932, Archives des Musées nationaux, X Expositions 9, "Prêteurs," "Wildenstein."
[46] « Wallrafmuseum ", telegram to Henri Verne, June 9, 1933, Archives des Musées nationaux, X Expositions 14, "Prêteurs", "Cologne" (emphasis added).
[47] O. Förster, Letter to J. Dupont, June 13, 1933, *Ibid*.

What is negotiated during these exchanges is the "national heritage" value of the objects. This value is far from being their simple market value. It is built instead out of complex interactions at the crossroads of different strategies and the expectations of two or more parties. For the representatives of the RMN, on every occasion there is the question of establishing how much ought to be yielded in terms of works loaned out as compensation, and the extent of the financial guarantees (in the form of insurance), in order to temporarily obtain pieces that were coming to seem essential to the restitution of a key phase in the history of French art. In the eyes of foreign partners, the steps taken by Parisian curators, especially their relentless negotiations, reinforce the perception of the prestige of their own (highly desired) collection, a prestige that literally manifests itself through the visibility of their works on the stage of the Paris museum world that the foreign museum's collaboration in these retrospectives makes possible.

The circulation of objects and the interactions between different interested parties determine not only the heritage value of the works, but, at a more general level, the heritage value of the complete oeuvre of each artist and more generally of the entire category of "impressionist painting." According to Robert Rey, the Manet exhibition presented a "gathering of work which the most important and distant museums of the world with the most beautiful collections collaborated on at great expense *and which we will probably never see again.*"[48] As exceptional and ephemeral events bringing together for a few months bodies of work that were destined to be quickly redispersed across the national territory and, more importantly, abroad, temporary exhibitions such as those at the Orangerie fostered this sense of the rarity and even the uniqueness of the aesthetic experience offered to the museum-goer. Not only does the symbolic value of the singular objects made visible under such special conditions become significantly enhanced, but their collective value as an integrated whole is also amplified.

Compared to the exhibition of "old masters" for whom the corpus of works was, with a few rare exceptions, already clearly established by the twentieth century, retrospectives on the art of the late nineteenth century, such as those mounted by the Orangerie, powerfully participate in the construction of the oeuvre and therefore in the creation of each artist's image—in every sense of the term. First the gathering and

[48] R. Rey, "Musée de l'Orangerie: L'exhibition Manet," *Bulletin des musées de France*, 4th Year, No. 7, July 1932, pp. 110-113 (emphasis added).

spatial distribution of objects, and then the different procedures of serial sequencing, attribution, and dating that go into the writing of the catalog all contribute to anchoring the work of these masters in a shared narrative of art history. All these indissociably material and intellectual operations nourish a historiographical practice that constitutes the condition of possibility of all heritage creation. The retrospectives at the Orangerie strongly contributed to the history-making status of Impressionism in both a technical sense (via its constitution as an object of historical discourse) and an emphatic sense (via its integration into a hierarchical pictorial tradition, its canonization). Organized as they were in a prestigious place that is central both in terms of the Parisian geography of fine arts and within the international system of museums, these exhibitions performed the inscription of impressionist painters and their oeuvres within a set of symbolic goods with a strong identitarian connotation: the history of *French* art.

Granted, this process was neither uniform nor exactly a matter of consensus. One need only recall the reception given to Monet's *Water Lilies,* whose permanent exhibition at the Orangerie was decided on in 1927 thanks in part to the campaign of Clemenceau in defense of the painter, to see that the affirmation of an institutional "taste" for Impressionism has always been a stratified and contested story.[49] One of the essential devices for the official recognition of the Impressionists, as the studies of Marie-Claude Genet-Delacroix have clearly shown[50], was the nationalization of their art. Other recent or ongoing research, notably the work of Laura Iamurri[51], reconstructs the ideological dimension of the erection of Impressionism into a national art.[52] The exhibitions at the Orangerie participate in this process of nationalization and the introductions to the catalogues signed by Paul Jamot clearly contribute to it.[53]

However, these events would have been unthinkable without the internationalization of public collections of which they were both an effect and a leading

---

[49] See S. Le Men, *Monet*, Paris, 2010, p. 378-387; M. Hoog, *Les nymphéas de Claude Monet au musée de l'Orangerie*, Paris, 1984 and Id., *Les Nymphéas avant et après,* cat. exp., Paris, 1992; G. Clemenceau *Claude Monet, les Nymphéas*, Paris, 1928 (reissued. 2010, preface by D. Dupuis-Labbé).

[50] M.-C. Genet-Delacroix, "La reconnaissance officielle des impressionnistes (1865-1925): art français ou art moderne ?," in F. Cousinié (dir.), *L'Impressionnisme: du plein air au territoire*, Rouen, 2013, p. 55-66. See also, M. Orwicz, "La vie posthume d'Édouard Manet: l'art national et la biographie artistique au début de la III^{ème} République," *Romantisme*, 93, 1996, p. 51-63.

[51] L. Iamurri, *Lionello Venturi e la modernità dell'impressionismo*, Rome, 2011, especially the first part "A Parigi: l'impressionismo, la pittura moderna, la crisi," pp. 23-104.

[52] See the thesis of M. Leglise on the reception of Manet and also the article by L. Piccioni, "Les enjeux politiques de la réception de l'Impressionnisme dans l'Italie fasciste," *Revue de l'Art*, 179/2013-1, pp. 35-40.

[53] D. Jacquot, "Paul Jamot (1863-1939) et l'histoire 'nationale' de l'art," *Histoire de l'art*, 47, 2000, pp. 29-38.

cause. While professing to be a "glorification of national art"[54], these events testify to the situation of collecting and of the market of French painting of the nineteenth century wherein France had lost its central position. An analysis of the provenance of the exhibited works shows the importance of the participation of foreign museums and collectors, a fact confirmed by studies of the location of Impressionists' works in the first decades of the twentieth century.[55] But if the quantitative study underscores the overall magnitude of the phenomenon, one cannot neglect the specific weight of certain works nor the symbolic significance of their presence outside France. In 1928, the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* published an article by the Austrian art historian Hans Tietze entitled "Les peintres français du XIX^{e} siècle dans les musées allemands" [Nineteenth Century French painters in German museums]. In this piece, which was probably commissioned by the editors, Tietze is particularly insistent about the value of the Impressionist paintings preserved across the Rhine, including some which were among the most representative works of the movement. "Manet, for example," Tietze claims, "is so well represented by works characteristic of all his periods that one can get a fairly accurate idea of this great artist based solely on Germany's public collections."[56] Readers of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* were treated to reproductions of some fundamental pieces, such as Manet's *Le Déjeuner* and Renoir's *L'Après-midi des enfants à Vargemont*, which the RMN would acquire permission to exhibit a few years later after lengthy negotiations *(fig. 10).*

During the 1930s, the process of making Impressionism part of a national heritage was the result of a complex movement between the nationalization of the image of these painters and the internationalization of collections, and between the circulation of works of art and the stabilization of a corpus through the gathering together of these works and the establishment of catalogues. Public events such as the major retrospectives at the Orangerie embody this national/international dialectic in a particularly striking way.[57] To take just one example, the *Manet* exhibition of 1932 is emblematic of the instituting of the artist into a national symbol. More than the

---

[54] H. Verne, letter to A. Dayot, September 1, 1933, Archives des Musées Nationaux, X Expositions 14, "catalogue".

[55] J. Heinen, "Un mécénat juif pour l'art moderne français? Etude de cas de la Galerie nationale de Berlin sous l'ère wilhelmienne (1882-1911)," a doctoral dissertation directed by M. Werner and E. François, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales/Freie Universität Berlin, 2011.

[56] H. Tietze, "Les peintres français du XIX^{e} siècle dans les musées allemands," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, I, 1928, pp. 105-118, here p. 112.

[57] On the nationalization/internationalization of Impressionism at the end of the nineteenth century, see B. Joyeux-Prunel, *Nul n'est prophète en son pays ?* [No one is a prophet in his own land?] L'internationalisation *de la peinture des avant-gardes parisiennes 1855-1914*, Paris, 2009, p. 38-55.

introductory essay to the catalogue, a text signed by Paul Jamot that exalts the "Frenchness" of Manet's work, the official poster helped to anchor in the public's imagination the "national" character of his painting. By choosing to have printed in blue (though actually painted black) the jacket of the fife player, and thus making it stand out vividly against the white of the strap and spats and the red of the pants, the organizers turned this painting into a patriotic icon *(fig. 11).*[58] Manet's work was nevertheless one of the most internationalized when one considers the number of different places of conservation, and the exhibition at the Orangerie was a stark reminder with forty-one paintings loaned by public or private foreign collections as compared with forty-four paintings gathered from French collections.

While we tend to associate the construction of a national heritage solely with processes of nationalization, these exhibitions allow one to measure the impact of the internationalization of art works and their wide circulation on the processes of value creation, historicization, and the inscription of objects within the set of identity goods that will constitute a national heritage, called by the French their *patrimoine*. Thinking about these interwoven and somewhat paradoxical aspects of the national and the international implies adopting a material and micro-historical approach to the dynamics of heritage creation that allow one to discern the mechanisms at work inside the heritage manufacture. It is a history of heritage reasoning "at ground level,"[59] on the factory floor so to speak, which, by being located at the microscopic scale of exhibition catalogue notices or the transactions presiding over the transfer of a particular object, allows the construction of heritage to be considered as resulting from the interaction between intellectual practices and strategic interests that are distinct and often in conflict.

[58] *Manet* Exhibition, Orangerie des Tuileries, Poster, Archives des Musées nationaux, X Exhibitions 10.
[59] J. Revel, "L'histoire au ras du sol," preface to G. Levi, *Le Pouvoir au village: Histoire d'un exorciste dans le Piémont du XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1989.